

***REMARKS***

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full response to the outstanding final Office Action, mailed January 11, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-8 and 16-27 are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Objection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 4 has been objected for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis. In response to the objection, claim 4 has been amended to overcome the stated objection. Under Rule 37 CFR 1.116, the aforementioned amendment may be made after final action in order to comply with any requirement of form expressly set forth in the previous Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amendment should be entered in the application, and Applicants also respectfully request that the objection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

3. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-8 and 16 have been rejected as allegedly being indefinite for failing to distinctly claiming the subject matter, which Applicants regard as their invention. In response to the objection, independent claim 1 has been amended to overcome the stated rejection.

Under Rule 37 CFR 1.116, the aforementioned amendment may be made after final action in order to comply with any requirement of form expressly set forth in the previous Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amendment should be entered in the application; and Applicants further respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-8 and 16 be withdrawn.

4. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Yamaguchi* (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,430). For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e), the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A method for forming a package for an electrical device, said method comprising the steps of:

***attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before one or more isolated conductive features have been formed within said conductive material;***

forming said isolated conductive features within said conductive material;  
attaching encapsulant to said isolated conductive features and said removable material; and

removing said removable material from said conductive features and said encapsulant.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Yamaguchi* does not disclose, teach, or suggest anywhere in the specification or in the figures at least the above-highlighted feature of “attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before one or more isolated conductive features have been formed within said conductive material,” as recited in claim 1.

*Yamaguchi* is apparently limited to an approach for manufacturing a semiconductor device where a “a metal plate for the lead frame 21 . . . is etched or pressed, thereby removing portions of the plate,” col. 8, lines 22-24, and “a pad assembly 16 including die pads 14, connection portions 16a and a frame 16b is formed by etching or pressing another metal plate,” col. 8, lines 34-27. Then after these steps, “a plastic film 12 . . . is attached to the lower surface of the main lead frame unit 15.” Col. 8, lines 45-48. Therefore, *Yamaguchi* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed step of “attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before one or more isolated conductive features have been formed within said conductive material.”

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-6 and 16

Dependent claims 2-6 and 16 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

5. Response to Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 7, and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, 5, 7, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Fjelstad* (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,872). For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e), the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A method for forming a package for an electrical device, said method comprising the steps of:

***attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before isolated conductive features have been formed within said conductive material;***

forming said isolated conductive features within said conductive material;  
attaching encapsulant to said isolated conductive features and said removable material; and

removing said removable material from said conductive features and said encapsulant.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Fjelstad* does not disclose, teach, or suggest anywhere in the specification or in the figures at least the above-highlighted feature of “attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before isolated conductive features have been formed within said conductive material,” as recited in claim 1. *Fjelstad* is apparently limited to an approach for manufacturing a microelectronic assembly including the steps of “providing a connection component having a dielectric element with electrically conductive parts; [and] providing a fugitive material in contact with the dielectric element.” Col. 3, lines 4. Therefore, *Fjelstad* fails to disclose, teach,

or suggest the claimed step of “attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before isolated conductive features have been formed within said conductive material.”

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 5, 7, and 16

Dependent claims 5, 7, and 16 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

6. Response to Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Yamaguchi* in view of *Glenn* (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,229). In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the cited art reference must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Dependent claim 2 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that claim 2 depends from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for the allowability of claim 2, the claims recite further features/steps and/or combinations of features/steps (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record.

7. Response to Rejection of Claims 7-8 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 7-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Yamaguchi* in view of *Wyland* (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,199) and *Weng* (U.S. Patent No. 5,972,234). In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the cited art reference must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Dependent claims 7-8 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that claims 7-8 depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for the allowability of claims 7-8, the claims recite further features/steps and/or combinations of features/steps (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record.

8. New Claims 17-27

Claims 17-27 have been newly added to further define and/or clarify the scope of various embodiments of the present disclosure. Claims 17-27 depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, since independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, dependent claims 17-27 are allowable for at least this reason.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-8 and 16-27 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1750  
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500